



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the æsthetic criticism of the period. Thus he accepts more readily than he otherwise would Fleay's conjecture in regard to the author of the *Third Blast*, for which the only confirmation known to me is Gosson's ambiguous and dubitable statement. Thus, also, he assigns too great an influence to the publication of Sidney's *Defense* (p. 115). For his main concern is with the Renaissance activity in dramatic affairs, and in this his appreciation is sound. His deductions in the matter may not be radical, nor even unexpected; but the facts presented are convincing—even where weakened by a merely enumerative arrangement—casting light on a subject heretofore too little considered. And, above all, the author has not attempted by amplification or exaggeration to assign to his material a value greater than it deserves.

ELBERT N. S. THOMPSON.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

On the Text of Chaucer's Parlement of Foules. By Eleanor Prescott Hammond. Chicago, 1902. (*University of Chicago Decennial Publications VII.*) Pp. 25.

Four years ago Miss Hammond won for herself some distinction as an investigator in the field of Middle English by her discovery in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, of a Christmas mumming by Lydgate (*Angl.* 22. 364–374). Her latest contribution to scholarship, if less striking, is even more creditable, resting as it does on no gift of lucky chance, but on laborious investigation and clear reasoning. The extent of her labor is suggested by the fact that her study is based on a collation of the entire text of Chaucer's *Parlement* in the fifteen mss. published by the Chaucer Society.

The stemma which Miss Hammond establishes agrees in the main with that indicated by Koch on the basis of a partial collation, in *Angl.* 4, *Anz.* p. 97, and reprinted by Heath in the Globe edition of Chaucer's Works. Four additional mss.—Caxton, Selden, Pepys, and Cambridge University Library, Hh. 4. 12—are included, and a slight change is made in the relationship of the mss. in the C group. This change consists in the association of Longleat with Digby rather than with Tanner, as indicated by Koch; but this association does not begin till after line 75. For the first 75 lines of the poem Miss Hammond argues a common affiliation of Longleat and Tanner to a ms. of the group represented by Fairfax and Bodley. But

unless the scribes of Tanner and Longleat were working from a common original, which according to the author's genealogy is not the case, it would be hard to explain why each scribe should have abandoned one exemplar, and taken up another, precisely at line 75.

Having established a stemma, the next step is to determine the relative value of the resulting ms. groups, and of the individual mss. within these groups. On this point Miss Hammond's statements are somewhat contradictory. Thus on page 9 she asserts that 'the text of the A archetype was probably nearer to the ultimate original verbally,' and says that in writing out a critical text she has been led to adhere to the readings of the A archetype when that and C are opposed. But at the end of her essay, after demonstrating that ms. Gg. of the University Library, Cambridge (A group) betrays signs of deliberate emendation on the part of its scribe, and after commenting on the 'complete freedom of Fairfax and Bodley (C group) from any tendency to meddle with the text, together with their sober accuracy of transcription and orthography,' she declares on page 24 that she does not find herself in full agreement with the evaluation of A as the better group: 'When the tendency of C to omit has been allowed for, as also its occasional slight lapses already mentioned, it will be recognized that the C group offers a set of readings certainly equal in value to those of A.' In view of these opposing statements, one feels that on this point the author has failed to speak the final word.

Before pursuing further this question of evaluation, it will be necessary to quote the list of divergent readings on which the division into two main groups is based. It is as follows:

Line *	3, A	<i>dreadful</i>	C	<i>blissful</i>
	* 5,	<i>wonderful</i>		<i>dreadful</i>
	* 5,	<i>astonyeth</i>		<i>astonyeth so</i>
	* 13,	<i>I dare</i>		<i>dare I</i>
	* 26,	<i>(as) of this</i>		<i>of my first</i>
	* 29,	<i>make of mencion</i>		<i>make mencion</i>
	* 30,	<i>as I shal telle</i>		<i>I shal you telle</i>
	* 32,	<i>seven it hadde</i>		<i>it hadde seven</i>
	* 35,	<i>say</i>		<i>tell</i>
	37,	<i>In—meteth</i>		<i>Into—mette</i>
	43,	<i>tellith it (or he)</i>		<i>told he him</i>
	44,	<i>shewed</i>		<i>yshewed</i>
	* 50,	<i>folk</i>		<i>the folk</i>

Line	* 55, A	<i>after</i>	C	<i>when</i>
	* 58,	<i>the hevens</i>		<i>hevens</i>
	64,	<i>bade (or said)—syn</i>		<i>bade—see</i>
	* 69,	<i>shuld</i>		<i>shal</i>
	* 70,	<i>is doon</i>		<i>was doon</i>
	* 72,	<i>into that</i>		<i>to</i>
	* 75,	<i>shalt not</i>		<i>shalt neuer</i>
	* 84,	<i>send us (or thee)</i>		<i>send each lover</i>
	*107,	<i>I had red</i>		<i>I red had</i>
	*110,	<i>totorne</i>		<i>al totorne</i>
	? 135,	<i>strokis</i>		<i>stroke</i>
	*137,	<i>neuer tree shal</i>		<i>tree shal neuer</i>
	*138,	<i>to</i>		<i>unto</i>
	*149,	<i>sette</i>		<i>ysette or is set</i>
	178,	<i>boxtre piper</i>		<i>box pipe tre</i>
	*188,	<i>that swimmen</i>		<i>and swimming</i>
	*192,	<i>so or som</i>		<i>that</i>
	*194,	<i>al aboute</i>		<i>aboute</i>
	? 206,	<i>wex or was</i>		<i>growen</i>
	*209,	<i>than man</i>		<i>no man</i>
	*215,	<i>her</i>		<i>hard</i>
	*217,	<i>for to</i>		<i>to</i>
	221,	<i>do before (or by force)</i>		<i>go before</i>
	*222,	<i>I will</i>		<i>I shall</i>
	? 229,	<i>shall not here</i>		<i>shall not</i>
	? 233,	<i>som ther were</i>		<i>som were</i>
	? 234,	<i>wer gay</i>		<i>gay</i>
	*237,	<i>of doves white</i>		<i>saw I white</i>
	*238,	<i>Sitting—100 (or 1000)</i>		<i>Of doves . . . 100</i>
	*240,	<i>sat with a</i>		<i>sat a</i>
	*241,	<i>by her side</i>		<i>her beside</i>
	*250,	<i>and wel</i>		<i>wel</i>
	338,	<i>hardy sparhawk</i>		<i>sparhawk</i>
	436,	<i>al be</i>		<i>al though</i>
	501,	<i>said</i>		<i>said tho</i>
	544,	<i>may not go</i>		<i>may not</i>
	666,	<i>brought</i>		<i>wrought</i>

After giving this table, Miss Hammond remarks: 'While making this division, several noteworthy facts become evident: first, the marked decrease in group-divergences after line 250; secondly, the

fact that in several cases the difference of group C from group A is due to an omission by the former archetype. . . . That in a poem of 699 lines 45 of the 50 cases of group-divergence should fall in the first 250 lines is a fact so noteworthy that it cries aloud for explanation; but Miss Hammond has no explanation to suggest.

Let us first examine the character of the divergences after line 250. In lines 338 and 544 we have omissions by C to the detriment of sense and metre. In line 501 C inserts *tho* to the detriment of the metre. In 436 and 666 we have substitutions by one scribe or the other, where it is impossible to determine the original reading. Such divergences are of the sort familiar to all textual critics, and are due, conceivably, to mere scribal carelessness. But in the first 250 lines not only do we find divergences of this kind much more frequently, but, in a number of instances, divergences which must be traced, not to carelessness, but to deliberate alteration by one of the scribes. Of the instances of mere careless error, the most striking are lines 43, 64, 178, 221, where A has the right reading except in 178. Of deliberate alteration I find clear proof in lines 3, 5, 32, 69 and 70, 84, 149 and 150 (?), 215, 237, and 238, where in every case A offers a reading clearly preferable on grounds of taste (though the C reading is perfectly possible), and where the divergence is of such a character as to preclude the hypothesis of mere carelessness on the part of either scribe. For example, in line 32, C reads in Fairfax,

Chapitres hyt had vij of hevene and helle,

a line which is in every way satisfactory save for the disagreeable internal rime of *seven* and *heven*. The A archetype, by inverting the word-order, puts the riming words further apart, and converts what was a blemish into a positive virtue. Other cases of transposition which seem to have been dictated by æsthetic considerations, though much less striking in their character, may be found in lines 13, 107, 137, 237, and 238. In line 35 disagreeable assonance is avoided by A's substitution of *say* for *tell*.

In several instances the alteration in A seems to have been made for the benefit of the metre. Thus a heavy syllable in the thesis of the last foot of line 215 is obviated by A's substitution of *her* for the *hard* of the C archetype. A frequently inserts or omits an unimportant word, and thereby secures a more regular metrical flow. Examples of such omission are found in lines 5, 110, 138, 229, 250; while lines 58, 72, 194, 217 are instances of insertion.

Space will not allow me to exhibit all the cases of variation in detail; but I have marked with an asterisk in the table of divergences all those which seem to me reasonably clear examples of emendation. If the reader cares to compare them with the printed texts, he will, I think, be convinced that my contention is not fanciful.

But who is this skilful reviser, and why does he stop his work at line 250? It is, of course, possible to assume that the A archetype was the work of two scribes, one an inventive and poetical man who deliberately 'edited' the text before him, the other, who took up the work at line 250, a sober, accurate man who copied what he found before him. My own belief, however, is that the reviser is none other than Chaucer himself. That Chaucer was a conscious literary artist is admitted, I suppose, by all critics. That he was in the habit of revising his own work is attested by the complete reworking of the *Knightes Tale*, and by the two versions of the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*.¹ If we may accept the theory advanced by Koch, and adopted by Ward and Skeat, that the *Parlement of Foules* was an occasional poem written to celebrate the nuptials of Richard II. and Anne of Bohemia, it may well enough have been composed in some hurry, in anticipation of a particular day. Evidence of such hurry is to be found in the abrupt way in which the poem ends.

When the festivities of the royal wedding were at an end, we may suppose that Chaucer set himself to the task of revising and polishing his work, before permitting its wider circulation. But every one knows Chaucer's sad habit of leaving his work half done. Revision is a tedious task anyway; and the poet, with scant leisure at his disposal, was impatient for fresh woods and pastures new. The revision was completed up to line 250, and then postponed to that more convenient other time which never came.

It will follow, then, if the theory here presented be received, that the critical text of the *Parlement of Foules* must accept the readings of the A group of MSS. in preference to those of the C group, except in the few instances in which the A archetype exhibits manifest scribal error, notably in line 178. The readings of the C archetype, when not clearly erroneous, should be given in the foot-notes as representing Chaucer's earlier version of the poem.

ROBERT K. ROOT.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

¹ Compare also Professor Lounsbury's remarks on the unfinished *Squieres Tale* in his *Studies in Chaucer* 3. 317-8.